

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.:	10/808,015	§ Confirmation No.:	5688
Applicant:	Dan Scott Johnson	§	
Filed:	March 24, 2004	§	
TC/A.U.:	2426	§	
Examiner:	Paul J. Graham	§	
Title:	AUDIO/VIDEO COMPONENT NETWORKING SYSTEM AND METHOD	§ § § § §	
Docket No.:	200207102-1 (HPC.0700US)	§ §	

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R § 41.37**

Sir:

The final rejection of claims 1-7, 11-19, 23 and 25-35 is hereby appealed.

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is the Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP. The Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 11445 Compaq Center Drive West, Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

## **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

None.

## **III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-7, 11-19, 23 and 25-35 have been finally rejected and are the subject of this appeal. Claims 8-10, 20-22, and 24 have been cancelled.

## **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendment after the final rejection of July 9, 2009 has been submitted. Therefore, all amendments have been entered.

## **V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The following provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Each element of the claims is identified by a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings where applicable. Note that the citation to passages in the specification and drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element.

Independent claim 1 recites an audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising:

    a plurality of source components (Fig. 1:16), each source component adapted to provide A/V program data (Spec., p. 4, ¶ [0020], ln. 5-10); and

    a sink component (Fig. 1:12) configured to be communicatively coupled to a presentation device (Fig. 1:12), the sink component adapted to receive A/V program data from at least one of the plurality of source components and transmit the received A/V program data to the presentation device (Spec., p. 5, ¶ [0021], ln. 1-25), and wherein the sink component is configured to present to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device (Spec., p. 26, ¶ [0072], ln. 7-8; ¶ [0074], ln. 1-10).

Independent claim 13 recites an audio/video (A/V) networking method, comprising:

    remotely accessing (Fig. 6:312; 316), via a sink component (Fig. 1:12), a plurality of source components (Fig. 1:16), each source component adapted to provide A/V program data (Spec., p. 22, ¶ [0060], ln. 9 - ¶ [0061], ln. 4);

    transmitting (Fig. 6:344), via the sink component, A/V program data from at least one of the source components to a presentation device (Spec., p. 23, ¶ [0064], ln. 7-9); and

    presenting (Fig. 9:616) to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device (Spec., p. 26, ¶ [0072], ln. 7-8; ¶ [0074], ln. 1-10).

Independent claim 34 recites a sink component (Fig. 1:12) comprising:

    a network interface (Fig. 2:44) to receive A/V program data from a plurality of source components (Fig. 1:16; Spec., p. 8, ¶ [0026], ln. 1-7); and

    a processor (Fig. 2:40) to:

        transmit (Fig. 6:344) A/V program data from at least one of the plurality of source components to a presentation device (Spec., p. 23, ¶ [0064], ln. 7-9);

        apply (Fig. 9:614) filtering to identify which of the A/V program data from the plurality of source components is presentable based on a type of the presentation device (Spec., p. 26, ¶ [0072], ln. 4-7; ¶ [0074], ln. 1-10);

create (Fig. 9:614) a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data that is presentable by the type of the presentation device (Spec., p. 26, ¶ [0072], ln. 4-7; ¶ [0074], ln. 1-10); and

present (Fig. 9:616) to a user the filtered aggregated listing (Spec., p. 26, ¶ [0072], ln. 7-8; ¶ [0074], ln. 1-10).

Claims 23 and 25-27, set forth below, include means plus function elements, which are identified as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37. For each means plus function element, the structure, material, or acts described in the Specification as corresponding to each claimed function is set forth by reference to page and line number, and to the drawings, by reference characters.

Independent claim 23 recites an audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising:

means (Fig. 2:44) for remotely accessing, via a sink component, a plurality of source components (Fig. 1:16), each source component adapted to provide A/V program data (Spec., p. 8, ¶ [0026], ln. 1-7);

means (Fig. 2:60), via the sink component (Fig. 1:12), for transmitting the A/V program data from at least one of the source components to a presentation device (Spec., p. 23, ¶ [0064], ln. 7-9); and

means (Fig. 2:62) for presenting to the user an aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device (Spec., p. 26, ¶ [0072], ln. 7-8; ¶ [0074], ln. 1-10).

Dependent claim 23 recites means (Fig. 2:60) for decoding the A/V program data for presentation on the presentation device (Spec., p. 9, ¶ [0029], ln. 1-10).

Dependent claim 23 recites means (Fig. 2:70) for registering at least one of the plurality of source components with the sink component (Spec., p. 10, ¶ [0031], ln. 5-7).

Dependent claim 27 recites means (Fig. 2:70) for registering each of the plurality of source components with the sink component (Spec., p. 10, ¶ [0031], ln. 5-7).

## VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

- A. **Claims 1, 4, 13, 19, 23, 28, 29, 31, 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,211) and Accarie (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0048757) in view of Salmonsen (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0049797).**
- B. **Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 12, 14-18, 25-27, 30, 33, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Williams, Jr. and Accarie and in view of Salmonsen and in view of Hunter (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0056118).**

## VII. ARGUMENT

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellant presents separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. Each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

- A. **Claims 1, 4, 13, 19, 23, 28, 29, 31, 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,211) and Accarie (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0048757) in view of Salmonsen (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0049797).**

### 1. **Claims 1, 4, 28.**

It is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of independent claim 1 over Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsen is in error.

To make a determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, several basic factual inquiries must be performed, including determining the scope and content of the prior art, and ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1965). Moreover, as held by the U.S. Supreme Court, it is important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine

reference teachings in the manner that the claimed invention does. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007).

Here, it is clear that even if Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsen were to be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of these references would not teach or hint at the claimed subject matter.

Specifically, claim 1 recites a sink component that is configured to, *inter alia*, present to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components **based on a type of the presentation device**. The Examiner stated that Williams and Accarie “are unclear on a listing of program data based on type of the presentation device.” 07/09/2009 Office Action at 4. This appears to be a concession that Williams and Accarie do not disclose presenting to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device. However, the Examiner cited Salmonsen as purportedly disclosing this feature, citing specifically to ¶¶ [0147] and [0148] of Salmonsen. *Id.* These two paragraphs of Salmonsen refer to an audio-visual system that includes PC-based software for interacting with an audio-visual device such as a DVD player. Paragraph [0147] of Salmonsen notes that the DVD player includes an emulator, and that the software supplies information to the emulator.

Paragraph [0148] of Salmonsen refers to media management software that supplies content in various formats for access by a server. The cited paragraph notes that the media management software is able to supply various types of content files. The cited paragraph also notes that the media management software is able to supply play lists and graphical user interface information such as navigation information and graphic elements.

Although reference is made to supplying play lists in Salmonsen, there is no hint given in either of these passages of Salmonsen regarding presenting to a user a **filtered** aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a **type** of the presentation device. Thus, the Office Action is factually incorrect in stating that ¶¶ [0147]-[0148] of Salmonsen disclose a play list that is based on a type of presentation device.

The Examiner also cited ¶ [0105] of Salmonsen (07/09/2009 Office Action at 5), which refers to a media renderer that includes a video object block (VOB) transcoder to convert from MPEG format to VOB files that are the standard format of DVD presentations and movies. However, there is nothing here that even remotely hints at presenting to a user a filtered aggregated listing of A/V program data based on a type of the presentation device.

The Response to Arguments section of the 07/09/2009 Office Action further argued that Fig. 15 of Williams does suggest “a listing of program data based on the type of presentation [device].” *Id.* at 2. Specifically, the Examiner pointed to the channel table in Fig. 15 of Williams. *Id.* The channel table 117 shows the channel assigned to each desktop. Williams, 11:14-16. Note that a “desktop” as used in Williams refers to a desktop maintained on a server PC for a corresponding set top box. Williams, 3:33-46. Mapping channels to desktops in the table 117 of Williams does not constitute presenting to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device.

The Response to Arguments section of the 07/09/2009 Office Action further argued that Accarie “suggests a listing of program data based on type of presentation data,” citing specifically to ¶¶ [0406]-[0408] of Accarie. 07/09/2009 Office Action at 2. The cited passages of Accarie refer to a learning function to learn second remote control signals sent by a remote

control pack specific to a terminal. Learning remote control signals, as taught by Accarie, has nothing to do with presenting a filtered aggregated listing based on a type of the presentation device, as claimed. The 07/09/2009 Office Action also referred to Fig. 10 of Accarie, which shows a remote control. There is nothing in this diagram of Accarie, or in the text accompanying this diagram, relating to presenting a filtered aggregated listing of A/V program data based on a type of the presentation device.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that even if Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens could be hypothetically combined, the hypothetical combination of the references would not provide any teaching or hint of the claimed subject matter. The obviousness rejection is therefore defective for at least this reason.

Moreover, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been prompted to combine the teachings of Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens to achieve the claimed subject matter. As noted above, none of the references provide any hint of a sink component configured to present to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of a presentation device. Absent the teachings provided by the present invention, this person of ordinary skill in the art would merely have provided a play list, as taught by Salmonsens, without any regard to a **type** of the presentation device. The only apparent basis for making the allegation of obviousness based on Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens, is impermissible hindsight that has benefited from the teachings of the present invention. Since no objective evidence exists that would indicate that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been prompted to combine these cited references to achieve the claimed invention, the obviousness rejection is further defective for this additional reason.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims is erroneous.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

**2. Claims 13, 19, 23.**

Independent claim 13 is also non-obvious over Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens.

Claim 13 recites an audio/video A/V networking method, comprising:

- remotely accessing, via a sink component, a plurality of source components, each source component adapted to provide A/V program data;
- transmitting, via the sink component, A/V program data from at least one of the source components to a presentation device; and
- presenting to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device.

For similar reasons as those stated above with respect to claim 1, the hypothetical combination of Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens clearly does not provide any teaching or hint of the “presenting” task of claim 13. Moreover, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that no reason existed that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens to achieve the claimed subject matter.

The obviousness rejection of claim 13 and its dependent claims is therefore defective. Independent claim 23 and its dependent claims are similarly non-obvious over Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

### 3. Claim 29.

Claim 29 depends indirectly from base claim 1, and therefore is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Moreover, claim 29 further recites that the sink component is configured to further apply a filtering criterion based on the types of the plural presentation devices to insert in the filtered aggregated listing those A/V program data presentable by the types of the plural presentation devices but **not** A/V program data that are **not presentable** by the types of the plural presentation devices.

With respect to claim 29, the Examiner cited Williams, column 17, lines 39-65. 07/09/2009 Office Action at 9. The cited passage in column 17 of Williams describes a programmable channel filter 62 that passes only specified channels onto a bus 65 and filters out all other channels, based on commands from a server 20. Williams, 17:40-46. A channel server permits centralized control of television viewing within a network, including control of which channels are viewed on which TV sets in the network and when those channels may be viewed. *Id.*, 17:49-53.

Although reference is made to filtering channels to be presented that passes only specified channels onto a bus and filters out all other channels, there is absolutely no hint in Williams that a filtering criterion is applied based on the **types** of the plural presentation devices to insert in the **filtered aggregated listing** A/V program data presentable by the **types** of the plural presentation devices but not A/V program data that are not presentable by the **types** of the plural presentation devices.

In Williams, a simple selection is made of what channels are to be viewed and what channels are not—there is absolutely no hint given of applying a filtering criterion based on the types of presentation devices, and based on such application of a filtering criterion, inserting into

a filtered aggregated listing those A/V program data presentable by the types of the plural presentation devices but not A/V program data that are not presentable by the types of the plural presentation devices.

For the foregoing additional reason, claim 29 is further allowable over the cited references.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claim is respectfully requested.

#### **4. Claims 31, 32.**

Claims 31 and 32 depend from base claim 13 and therefore are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13. Moreover, claims 31 and 32 are further allowable for similar reasons as those stated above with respect to claim 29.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

#### **5. Claim 34.**

Independent claim 34 is also non-obvious over Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsen.

Claim 34 recites a sync component comprising:

- a network interface to receive A/V program data from a plurality of source components; and
- a processor to:
  - transmit A/V program data from at least one of the plurality of source components to a presentation device;
  - apply filtering to identify which of the A/V program data from the plurality of source components is presentable based on a type of the presentation device;
  - create a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data that is presentable by the type of the presentation device; and
  - present to a user the filtered aggregated listing.

With respect to claim 34, it is respectfully submitted that the hypothetical combination of Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens fails to provide any hint of applying filtering to identify which of the A/V program data is presentable based on a **type** of the presentation device, in combination with creating a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data that is presentable by the **type** of the presentation device. As discussed above in connection with claim 1, none of the cited references provide any hint of the foregoing subject matter. Various passages of Salmonsens cited by the Examiner as purportedly disclosing the filtered aggregated listing (conceded by the Examiner to be missing from Williams and Accarie) clearly do not provide any hint of such filtered aggregated listing of A/V program data that is presentable by the **type** of the presentation device.

Moreover, as explained above in connection with claim 29, Williams, in column 17, lines 39-65, simply describes selecting programs that are to be viewed and filtering other programs, with no hint of applying filtering to identify A/V program data presentable based on a **type** of the presentation device.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that the hypothetical combination of the references would not have led to the claimed subject matter. Moreover, for reasons similar to those stated above with respect to claim 1, no reason existed that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens to achieve the subject matter of claim 34.

The obviousness rejection of claim 34 and its dependent claim is therefore erroneous.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claim is respectfully requested.

**B. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 12, 14-18, 25-27, 30, 33, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Williams, Jr. and Accarie and in view of Salmonsens and in view of Hunter (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0056118).**

**1. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 12, 14-18, 25-27, 30, 33.**

In view of the allowability of base claims over Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of dependent claims over Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens, and Hunter has been overcome.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claims is respectfully requested.

**2. Claim 35.**

In view of the allowability of base claim 34 over Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsens, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of dependent claim 35 over Williams, Accarie, Salmonsens, and Hunter has been overcome.

Moreover, claim 35 further recites a decoder, where the processor is to further determine whether the decoder is able to decode the A/V program data from the plurality of source components, and to insert into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V program data that are decodable by the decoder, but to not insert into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V program data that are not decodable by the decoder.

In the rejection of claim 35, Hunter was cited as purportedly disclosing a decoder. However, Hunter does not provide any hint of the subject matter of claim 35 that relates to a processor to determine whether the decoder is able to decode the A/V program data, and to insert into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V program data that are decodable by the decoder, but to not insert into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V program data that is not decodable by the decoder.

The other references (Williams, Accarie, and Salmonsen) do not provide any hint of the above subject matter that is not hinted at by Hunter.

Therefore, claim 35 is further allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Reversal of the final rejection of the above claim is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reversal of all final rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 26, 2009

/Dan C. Hu/

Dan C. Hu  
Registration No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
Telephone: (713) 468-8880  
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883

### **VIII. APPENDIX OF APPEALED CLAIMS**

The claims on appeal are (claims 8-10, 20-22, and 24 have been cancelled):

1       1. An audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising:  
2       a plurality of source components, each source component adapted to provide A/V  
3       program data; and

4       a sink component configured to be communicatively coupled to a presentation device, the  
5       sink component adapted to receive A/V program data from at least one of the plurality of source  
6       components and transmit the received A/V program data to the presentation device, and wherein  
7       the sink component is configured to present to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V  
8       program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the  
9       presentation device.

1       2. The system of Claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to decode the  
2       received A/V program data.

1       3. The system of Claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to transmit the  
2       received A/V program data to the presentation device in real-time.

1       4. The system of Claim 1, wherein at least one of the source components is selected  
2       from the group consisting of a satellite receiver source component, a digital versatile disk (DVD)  
3       source component, a compact disc (CD) source component, a computer, and a cable source  
4       component.

1       5. The system of Claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a  
2       registration operation to register at least one of the plurality of source components with the sink  
3       component.

1       6.     The system of Claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a  
2 registration operation to register at least one available type of communication network for  
3 communicating with at least one of the plurality of source components.

1       7.     The system of Claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a  
2 registration operation to register a format of the A/V program data available from each of the  
3 plurality of source components.

1       11.    The system of Claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a  
2 registration operation to register the presentation device with the sink component.

1       12.    The system of Claim 1, wherein at least two of the plurality of source components  
2 comprise the same type of source component.

1       13.    An audio/video (A/V) networking method, comprising:  
2           remotely accessing, via a sink component, a plurality of source components, each source  
3 component adapted to provide A/V program data;  
4           transmitting, via the sink component, A/V program data from at least one of the source  
5 components to a presentation device; and  
6           presenting to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from  
7 each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device.

1       14.    The method of Claim 13, further comprising performing a registration operation  
2 to register at least one of the plurality of source components with the sink component.

1       15.    The method of Claim 13, further comprising performing a registration operation  
2 to register each of the plurality of source components with the sink component.

1       16.    The method of Claim 13, further comprising performing a registration operation  
2 to register a format of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source  
3 components.

1        17. The method of Claim 13, further comprising decoding the A/V program data for  
2 presentation on the presentation device.

1        18. The method of Claim 13, further comprising performing a registration operation  
2 to register a type of a communication network for obtaining the A/V program data from at least  
3 one of the plurality of source components.

1        19. The method of Claim 13, wherein accessing the plurality of source components  
2 comprises accessing at least one of a group consisting of a satellite receiver source component, a  
3 digital versatile disk (DVD) source component, a compact disc (CD) source component, a  
4 computer, and a cable source component residing on the centralized storage system.

1        23. An audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising:  
2            means for remotely accessing, via a sink component, a plurality of source components,  
3 each source component adapted to provide A/V program data;  
4            means, via the sink component, for transmitting the A/V program data from at least one  
5 of the source components to a presentation device; and  
6            means for presenting to the user an aggregated listing of the A/V program data available  
7 from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device.

1        25. The system Claim 23, further comprising means for decoding the A/V program  
2 data for presentation on the presentation device.

1        26. The system Claim 23, further comprising means for registering at least one of the  
2 plurality of source components with the sink component.

1        27. The system of Claim 23, further comprising means for registering each of the  
2 plurality of source components with the sink component.

1        28.    The system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is configured to be  
2 communicatively coupled to plural presentation devices, and wherein the sink component is  
3 configured to present to the user the filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available  
4 from the plural source components based on the types of the plural presentation devices.

1        29.    The system of claim 28, wherein the sink component is configured to further  
2 apply a filtering criterion based on the types of the plural presentation devices to insert in the  
3 filtered aggregated listing those A/V program data presentable by the types of the plural  
4 presentation devices but not A/V program data that are not presentable by the types of the plural  
5 presentation devices.

1        30.    The system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is configured to further  
2 determine whether the sink component is able to decode the A/V program data from the plurality  
3 of source components, and to insert into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V program data that  
4 are decodable by the sink component.

1        31.    The method of claim 13, further comprising:  
2            applying, by the sink component, a filtering criterion based on the type of the  
3 presentation device to insert in the filtered aggregated listing those A/V program data presentable  
4 by the type of the presentation device but not A/V program data that are not presentable by the  
5 type of the presentation device.

1        32.    The method of claim 13, wherein transmitting the A/V program data comprises  
2 transmitting the A/V program data from the at least one of the source components to plural  
3 presentation devices, the method further comprising:  
4            applying, by the sink component, a filtering criterion based on types of the presentation  
5 devices to insert in the filtered aggregated listing those A/V program data presentable by the  
6 types of the presentation devices but not A/V program data that are not presentable by the types  
7 of the presentation devices.

1       33.     The method of claim 13, further comprising:  
2           determining, by the sink component, whether the sink component is able to decode the  
3     A/V program data from the plurality of source components; and  
4           inserting into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V program data that are decodable by  
5     the sink component.

1       34.     A sink component comprising:  
2           a network interface to receive A/V program data from a plurality of source components;  
3     and  
4           a processor to:  
5               transmit A/V program data from at least one of the plurality of source components  
6     to a presentation device;  
7               apply filtering to identify which of the A/V program data from the plurality of  
8     source components is presentable based on a type of the presentation device;  
9               create a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data that is presentable by  
10    the type of the presentation device; and  
11               present to a user the filtered aggregated listing.

1       35.     The sink component of claim 34, further comprising a decoder, wherein the  
2     processor is to further determine whether the decoder is able to decode the A/V program data  
3     from the plurality of source components, and to insert into the filtered aggregated listing the A/V  
4     program data that are decodable by the decoder, but to not insert into the filtered aggregated  
5     listing the A/V program data that are not decodable by the decoder.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

**X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.